

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,741	07/07/2003	Kimberly A. Anderson	S16.12-0136	6207
27367 7590 09/10/2007 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A. SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			EXAMINER	
			GANESAN, SUBA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

6) Other: __

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/614,741 Page 2

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the reinforcement having apertures for insertion of the fastener) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Fig. 2b of Ross (U.S. Pat. No. 5,089,015) depicts a reinforcement attached to the commissure supports.
- 3. Claims 21-22 were previously considered allowable subject matter but are now rejected in view of the amendment dated 7/25/2007, since certain limitations have been removed from the claimed subject matter.

Application/Control Number: 10/614,741 Page 3

Art Unit: 3738

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 20-24, 26-27 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being 4. unpatentable over Ross (5,089,015) in view of Williamson IV et al (6,402,780). Ross discloses a method for attaching a stentless porcine heart valve prosthesis comprising inserting fasteners (sutures) through the prosthesis through an aortic wall (col. 4, lines 16-26), the prosthesis comprising leaflets with reinforced valve commissures (Fig. 2B) Note that the examiner is considering the Dacron cover depicted in Fig. 2B to be a reinforcement covering the commisure supports, consequently the reinforcement is attached to the surface of the commisure supports. However Ross does not disclose the fastener having a head and barbed tip. Williamson IV et al teaches the use of a fastener having a head and sharp barbed tip (e.g. Fig. 65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of a fastener having a head and tip, as taught by Williamson IV et al, to a method as per Ross, the fasteners of Williamson IV et al being capable of connecting vascular tissues or implants to tissues (see abstract) in situations where the use of sutures would be more difficult (col. 2, lines 5-18). It would have further been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to attach the fasteners to the reinforcement prior to

Art Unit: 3738

inserting the faster in the aortic wall, root, or pulmonary artery wall for the purpose of reducing operating time by preloading the fasteners onto the implant.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 34 and 36-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filling of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/614,741 Page 5

Art Unit: 3738

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suba Ganesan whose telephone number is 571-272-3243. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SDG 8/29/2007

Brian & Pellegrino PRIMARY EXAMINED